Rye City Planning Commission Minutes

June 24, 2003

1	PRESENT:	
2		
3	Michael Klemens, Chairman	
4	Barbara Cummings, Vice-Chair	
5	Franklin Chu	
6	Peter Larr	
7	Martha Monserrate	
8	ADCENT.	
9	ABSENT:	
10	Hugh Greechan	
11	Patrick McGunagle	
12	ALSO DDEG	SENT.
13 14	ALSO PRES	DENI.
15	Christian K. Miller, AICP, City Planner	
16	Simolarita minor, there is easy trial more	
17	I. HEAF	RINGS
18	,	
19	1. 439 G	Grace Church Street
20		
21	Chairman Klemens read the public notice.	
22		
23	Kim Abt (property owner) provided an overview of the application noting that it involved the	
24	installation of a split-rail fence with deer mesh in the rear yard of her residence. She noted	
25	that the fence was being installed for the safety of her children.	
26		
27	There were no public comments.	
28		
29	On a motion made by Peter Larr, seconded by Franklin Chu and carried by the following	
30	vote:	
31		
32	AYES:	Michael Klemens, Barbara Cummings, Franklin Chu, Peter Larr, Martha
33	NIA) (O	Monserrate
34	NAYS:	None
35	RECUSED:	
36	ABSENT:	Hugh Greechan, Patrick McGunagle
37 38	the Planning Commission took the following action:	
39	the Planning Commission took the following action:	
39 40	ACTION:	The Planning Commission closed the public hearing on wetland permit
41	ACTION.	application number WP128.
42		application number in 120.

June 24, 2003 Page 2 of 2

ITEMS PENDING ACTION

1. 439 Grace Church Street

 The Commission discussed the proposed fence design and its potential impact on impeding wildlife migratory patterns. The Commission noted that turtles migrate across Grace Church from the wetland near the applicant's property. The Commission noted that a sample of the fence materials or a cross-section of its design were not provided for its review. A plan showing the preferred location of these openings was provided for the file.

The Commission agreed that the fence design should be modified to include three openings approximately 2'x3', which would be wide enough to accommodate turtles and allow them to travel through the applicant's rear yard to the front of the residence.

On a motion made by Martha Monserrate, seconded by Barbara Cummings and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Michael Klemens, Barbara Cummings, Franklin Chu, Peter Larr, Martha

Monserrate

22 NAYS: None 23 RECUSED: None

ABSENT: Hugh Greechan, Patrick McGunagle

the Planning Commission took the following action:

ACTION: The Planning Commission conditionally approved wetland permit application number WP128.

2.

2. Walker Subdivision

The Commission discussed the location of the common driveway and whether it should be shifted further north to create additional separation from the rear yards of existing residences along Rockridge Road. The City Planner and Alan Pilch (applicant's environmental consultant) noted that shifting the driveway further north would result in the loss of a mature stand of hemlock trees, which serves as a significant screen. The Commission agreed that the loss of this screen would not be a good trade-off for the seven additional feet of driveway separation that could be achieved. The City Planner noted that the resident of 5 Rockridge Road who submitted a letter to the Commission did not note concern with the location of the common driveway on the western half of the property, but

June 24, 2003 Page 3 of 3

suggested that the Commission provide greater separation from the rear yards towards the eastern half of the property.

The Commission considered the driveway separation on the eastern half of the property. The Commission agreed that the landscape area along the southern property line should be widen to no less than 28 feet where it abuts the rear of property line of 11, 15 and 17 Rockridge Road. The Commission stated that the restriction for the perimeter property lines should indicate that the intent of the landscape areas is to provide in perpetuity plant material at least six feet in height to serve as a screen for abutting neighbors.

The Commission discussed the restrictions for the portion of the property within the 100-foot wetland buffer. The Commission agreed that the narrow portion of Lot 3 extending to Manursing Way should be placed in a conservation easement requiring the property to be left in its natural state. That portion of the property not located within this area, but within the 100-foot wetland buffer should be less restrictive, but in no case allow the placement of any structure or significant site disturbance. Routine maintenance and landscaping would be permitted in this area. The Commission also requested that appropriate markers be provided to delineate the edge of the 100-foot wetland buffer. The Commission noted that all restrictions would be provided for its review in connection with final subdivision plat approval.

On a motion made by Michael Klemens, seconded by Peter Larr and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Michael Klemens, Barbara Cummings, Franklin Chu, Peter Larr, Martha

Monserrate

27 NAYS: None28 RECUSED: None

ABSENT: Hugh Greechan, Patrick McGunagle

the Planning Commission took the following action:

ACTION: The Planning Commission conditionally approved preliminary subdivision and LWRP Coastal Consistency application number SUB272.

3. 14 Lake Road

Vice-Chair Cummings recused herself from the discussion of this matter and left the hearing room.

Alan Pilch (applicant's environmental consultant) provided an overview of the application noting that it involved the construction of an addition to an existing residence. Mr. Pilch noted that the existing residence is approximately 4,750 square feet and that the proposed

June 24, 2003 Page 4 of 4

addition would add approximately 2,100 square feet. Mr. Pilch stated that the proposed increase would require a FAR variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which had not yet been applied for. All wetland areas were deducted from the calculation of lot area. Serge Nivelle (property owner) indicated that the proposed variance was modest and represented an approximately 5-6% increase over existing permitted FAR restrictions.

Mr. Pilch provided an overview of the proposed mitigation plan and the net increase in impervious area on the property. It was noted that the existing carport on the property is in poor condition and would be removed and replaced with wetland plantings. The total increase in impervious area was approximately 1,839 square feet and that the total mitigation area was approximately 3,715 square feet, exceeding the 2:1 mitigation ratio required by the Commission.

The Commission discussed possible enhancements to the mitigation plan including extending the landscape mitigation area parallel the water's edge at the rear of the property. Mr. Pilch recommended against this recommendation noting that the plantings could interfere with the private sewer easement bisecting the rear of the property. In addition he noted that the planted area would quickly become overwhelmed by phyragmities. The management of this invasive species would be improved if it were maintained as lawn. The Commission agreed with Mr. Pilch's recommendation. The Commission noted, however that additional plantings or other enhancements to the isolated pocket wetland on the property might be desired.

On a motion made by Peter Larr, seconded by Franklin Chu and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Michael Klemens, Franklin Chu, Peter Larr, Martha Monserrate

28 NAYS: None

29 RECUSED: Barbara Cummings

30 ABSENT: Hugh Greechan, Patrick McGunagle

the Planning Commission took the following action:

ACTION: The Planning Commission set a public hearing for its July 22, 2003 meeting for wetland permit application number WP129.

4. Warner

Alan Pilch (applicant's environmental consultant) provided an overview of the application noting that it involved the placement of a pump in the rear yard and the extension of piping to an existing catch basin in the Manursing Way right-of-way. Mr. Pilch noted that the applicant was seeking the improvement to remove excess surface water that has accumulated on the property since the implementation of grading activities on the adjacent

June 24, 2003 Page 5 of 5

1 Killian property. It was noted that the Killian property was subject to a wetlands violation 2 and was required to implement remediation measures by the Planning Commission last 3 year.

The Commission noted concern that the proposed measures may drain an existing wetland area and that this may set an undesirable precedent. The City Planner added that other property owners in the City, including the adjacent Odem property, are seeking similar requests to alleviate stormwater ponding. Mr. Pilch stated that the Warner application was unique since the area in question was not a wetland and had only recently become a problem as a result of grading activities on an abutting neighbors property conducted last year. Mr. Pilch added that the wetland would not be drained and that all activities would be within a wetland buffer.

The Commission requested that the applicant provide soil boring information to confirm the soil conditions and that no wetlands were on the property. The Commission further requested that the height of the catch basin be no lower than the existing grade on the property. This would allow only excess surface water to be drained, preserving below grade hydric conditions. The Commission requested that a detail of the proposed catch basin be provided for its review.

The Commission requested that the plan be revised to address stormwater quality concerns. The Commission noted that recent Phase II regulations require the City to be concerned regarding the introduction of pollutants into a City drainage system. The Commission requested that additional wetland plantings be provided around the pump to improve water quality. Mr. Pilch discussed the design of the proposed pump, which included silt sacks to prevent silt from passing through the system.

On a motion made by Peter Larr, seconded by Barbara Cummings and carried by the following vote:

AYES: Michael Klemens, Barbara Cummings, Franklin Chu, Peter Larr, Martha

Monserrate

33 NAYS: None 34 RECUSED: None

35 ABSENT: Hugh Greechan, Patrick McGunagle

the Planning Commission took the following action:

ACTION: The Planning Commission set a public hearing for its July 22, 2003 meeting

for wetland permit application number WP130.

5. Osborn Parking Modification

June 24, 2003 Page 6 of 6

Martha Monserrate disclosed that she is a member of the Osborn Capital Improvement Committee and that she is aware of the applicant's parking improvement plans. She added that she did not feel her relationship represented a conflict of interest but wanted to disclose her involvement to the Commission and for the record. The Commission agreed that there was no conflict of interest.

Frank McCullough (applicant's attorney) noted that the applicant was seeking to add approximately 50 parking spaces on the property to address parking demand concerns. Mr. McCullough added that at the time of the approval for the expansion of the Osborn in 1993 the City did not have an applicable parking standard. At that time the City and applicant relied upon parking studies for other comparable facilities. Mr. McCullough noted that there was an approximately 30-space shortfall on the property to serve employee parking needs. He also added that additional parking for occasional events was necessary.

Mr. McCullough noted that the application included a 36-space parking lot near Theall Road, but that based on the site inspection and staking of that lot, that the applicant was concerned about the loss of mature trees. As a result, Mr. McCullough requested consideration of an alternate plan consisting of approximately 47 spaces interspersed throughout the property. This alternate plan would include spaces on the Boston Post Road side of the property, but would not be within the 160-foot setback established as part of the original site plan approval for the property in 1993.

Gerry Schwalbe (applicant's engineer) provided an overview of the revised plan. He noted that the previous plan would involve the loss of 11 trees and that revised plan would include no tree loss. The Commission noted the significance of the landscaping on the property in terms of preserving the character of the site. Mr. Schwalbe agreed and noted that the Osborn has an aggressive tree preservation, protection and maintenance program. Mr. Schwalbe added that screening (including both plant material and berming) of the proposed parking area along Boston Post Road would be provided for the Commission's review.

ACTION: The Planning Commission set a public hearing for its July 22, 2003 meeting for modified final site plan and use permitted subject to additional standards and requirements number SP274.

6. Beechwind

Serge Nivelle and Judy Studebaker of the Rye City Zoning Board of Appeals joined the Commission for the discussion of this matter.

June 24, 2003 Page 7 of 7

The City Planner provided an overview of the review process to date noting that the Commission reached general consensus at its last meeting that the project was consistent with the City's LWRP policies, but that site design and other planning issues had not been resolved. The City Planner added that it was his understanding that those issues would be addressed at this meeting and that they included concerns regarding the development intensity, off-street parking for the public access area, building orientation, visual access to the water from Milton Road, number of curb-cuts and wetland permit considerations.

The Commission first discussed the opportunities for wetland mitigation and enhancements. Rex Gedney (applicant's architect) noted that currently nearly 98% of the site is impervious and that the proposed site plan included approximately 40% pervious green space. The Commission agreed that the plan would provide significant opportunities for wetland plantings and stormwater quality measures. Neal DeLuca (applicant's partner) noted that a Phase II environmental site assessment had been conducted and the some clean-up of the property would be necessary, but that such clean-up was within manageable limits.

The Commission discussed the proposed number of curb-cuts and considered alternative designs to reduce the number of curb-cuts from three to two. Mr. Gedney noted that the number of curb-cuts would be increased from two to three, which was not significant. The Commission agreed that the four properties should be limited to three curb-cuts.

The Commission discussed the proposed building intensity and orientation. The principal concern of the Commission focused on the apparent monotony of the proposed house design and layout contributing to a "cookie-cutter" effect. The Commission also noted concern with the impact the proposed house design would have on blocking views of the Harbor from Milton Road. The proposed wall along the front property line was also a concern. To address this concern the applicant agreed that no fencing or walls would be provided along the front property line. In addition, the Commission agreed that the applicant should modify the site plan to create further separation between proposed Lots 2 and 3. This design modification would serve to break up the repetitive design of the proposed subdivision and create an opportunity for a wider central corridor to provide views to the Harbor. The applicant agreed to consider modifications to the plan to address this concern.

 The Commission discussed the need for off-street parking to be incorporated into the site plan. The Commission noted that off-street parking spaces are important to supporting suitable public access, which is strongly encouraged by the LWRP. On-site parking was preferred over any off-site parking solution. Mr. Gedney noted that provided parking on-site would be challenging given the size of the property and the impact it could have on the marketability of the proposed residences.

June 24, 2003 Page 8 of 8

The Commission discussed the proposed use/re-use of the Gedney Store. Mr. Gedney noted that the store is intended to be preserved and that it has been incorporated on a building lot. It would serve as an accessory building to a principal residence. The Commission noted that the structure should be restricted to preserve and enhance its historic character. The Commission discussed possible deed restrictions or referral to the City's Landmarks Committee for review.

Sid Burke (Landmarks Committee member) noted concern with the size and orientation of the proposed residences and encouraged the applicant to reconsider its design. He noted that such redesign should respect the existing character of the neighborhood.

The Commission agreed to provide a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals at its next meeting after it has an opportunity to review the applicant's revised plans.

7. Discussion of City Council Referral – AYC MC District Rezoning Request

Commission member Larr stated that as a member of AYC that he would need to recuse himself from the discussion of the proposed rezoning request. Jonathan Kraut (AYC Attorney) noted that since no formal petition has been submitted to the City Council that such a recusal would be premature. He also added that in his opinion there would be no conflict of interest and that such recusal would not be necessary. The City Planner noted that the proposed rezoning request would impact other club properties located in the MC District and that at least three additional Commission members are members of these clubs. He added that if each Commission member recused based on their affiliation with a membership club that there would be no quorum to discuss the matter.

The Commission questioned he need for the rezoning and AYC's future development plans. Mr. Kraut responded that AYC has no specific funding or implementation plan at this time, but that it is looking to expand the number of moorings. The existing number of moorings do not meet current demand.

The Commission noted that the proposed rezoning raises a number of significant land use policy issues impacting Milton Point. The Commission noted that the proposed rezoning offers an opportunity to reconsider the zoning for the MC District and some of the issues raised in a prior "Hot Spots" study conducted by the City which evaluated the development potential of some of the City's membership clubs. Given the hour and the nature of the application, the Commission agreed that it would conduct a special meeting to discuss the rezoning. The Commission requested that the membership clubs and other potentially effected properties be invited to attend the meeting.

8. 55 Drake Smith

June 24, 2003 Page 9 of 9

Alan Pilch (applicant's environmental consultant) provided an overview of the application, noting that it involved the construction of a new residence on a vacant lot within the 100-foot wetland buffer. Mr. Pilch explained that the primary wetland was to the rear of the property and that no activity was proposed within the 100-foot buffer. He noted a small drainage swale on the property that was identified as wetland and that it was within that buffer that the proposed residence would be located.

Mr. Pilch explained that the house footprint would be approximately 3,000 square feet and that most of the buffer that would be impacted currently consists of lawn.

The Commission agreed not to set a public hearing until after it conducted a site walk of the property prior to its next meeting on July 22.

9. 30 High Street

Greg DeAngelis (applicant's architect) provided an overview of the application noting that it involved the construction of a service business and two, two-family residences on a property located at 30 High Street. He noted that an existing City sewer line bisects the property and that this line is located outside an existing three-foot easement. This line would be relocated.

The Commission expressed concern with the intensity of the proposed development given the congested neighborhood pattern. It noted that the Board of Architectural Review had similar concerns and provided copies of these advisory comments to the applicant. The Commission also noted concern with the proposed use of a common driveway that would be shared with business and residential uses. The Commission has had problems with similar configurations in the past and recommended that the site plan be revised to include separate driveways for the business and residential uses. The City Planner added that the proposed mix of business and two-family on the same building lot was being reviewed for zoning compliance. He noted that the site plan would likely need to be changed to have each use on its own building lot.

The Commission agreed not to set a public hearing until after it conducted a site walk of the property prior to its next meeting on July 22.

10. Minutes

The Commission reviewed and approved minutes of its May 13, 2003 meeting.

June 24, 2003 Page 10 of 10